

## REMARKS

With this response, applicants submit Figures 1-15 as formal drawings.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and following comments. This amendment changes and deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing is presented, with an appropriately defined status identifier, of all claims that are or were in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination.

Claims 35-38 are currently requested to be cancelled. Claims 11, 16, 30, and 33-34 are amended.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 7-12, 28, 29, 31, 32, 34 and 35 are allowable. Applicants have made only two minor changes to these claims. First, applicants amended claim 11 to correct the antecedent basis. This amendment does not enlarge or contract the scope of the claim, but rather clarifies its dependency. Second, applicants amended claim 34 to correct a technical error. Applicants believe that these claims remain allowable. Applicants also cancelled claim 35.

With respect to the claims that were rejected, applicants amended claims 30 and 33 by italicizing the Latin names as suggested by the Examiner. These amendments do not change the scope of either claim. Applicants believe that these amendments overcome the indefiniteness rejection identified by the Examiner and place the claims in condition for allowance. Applicants also amended claim 33 to properly depend from claim 32.

Applicants amended claim 13, as recommended by the Examiner, to remove the phrase “or retroviral vectors” in each location where it appeared. Applicants believe that claim 13 as amended is sufficiently described and enabled by the specification. Accordingly, this claim, and its corresponding dependent claims 14-15, are now in condition for allowance.

Finally, applicants amended claim 16 to recite that the polypeptide is PEGylated as recommended by the Examiner. Applicants believe that this amendment overcomes the

written description and enablement rejections and places claims 16-20 in condition for allowance.

Applicant believes that the pending claims in the present application are now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to discuss the amendments or if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

By making the amendments contained herein, applicants do not intend to abandon subject matter and instead specifically retain the right to file a continuing application to any material described in the specification.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 7 January 2005

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 22428  
Telephone: (202) 672-5404  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By S.A. Bent

Stephen A. Bent  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 29,768